Remarks

In the present response, claims 15-26 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner argues that word "selectively" in claim 21 is not defined in the specification and fails to guide a user how to selectively decide whether to remove a data value or not. Applicants respectfully traverse.

First, the word "selectively" appeared in the original claim 21. **Original claims filed in an application form part of the specification.** Thus, support for the term "selectively" is found in the language of the originally filed claims.

Second, the original specification clearly supports selectively removing data to refine the classification rules. In fact, the original specification even discusses examples:

> In particular, the mining phase may generate classification rules that
> classify process instances based on attributes that are not interesting in
> the specific case being considered. For example, when an obvious and
> not interesting correlation is generated, an analyst may want to repeat
> the mining phase and selectively remove one or more attributes from
> the ones considered in generating the classification rules, so that the
> classifier can focus on more meaningful attributes. (See p. 14, lines 22-
> 28).

As yet another example, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to review Figure 4 and read the specification at p. 16, lines 13-25. This section discusses in detail generating classification rules and then modifying them by removing input data.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 15-25 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Specification and Implementation of Exceptions in Workflow Management Systems" (Casati). These rejections are traversed.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Casati does not teach each element in the claims, these claims are allowable over Casati.

Independent claims 15 and 23 recite numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Casati. By way of example, claim 15 recites predicting exceptions <u>before</u> the exception occurs and performing an action during execution of the workflow to avoid occurrence of the exception in the workflow. Claim 23 recites generating a probability of an exception occurring in a workflow process. When the probability exceeds a threshold, claim 23 recite performing an action during execution of the workflow process to avoid the exception.

By contrast, Casati discloses an exception handler that reacts to exceptions **<u>after</u>** the exceptions occur. In other words, once an exception occurs, the exception handler in Casati reacts to the exception:

> The exception-handling mechanism must be able to *capture* exceptional events and to *react* to them. Each reaction must first assess the state of the process and then, in a few cases, adopt the corrective action; in many cases events correspond to false alarms and do not need to be followed by a corrective action. (See Casati at p. 407, lines 3-7).

Casati clearly states that his exception handler is triggered or activated once an exception occurs. After the exception is detected, actions are initiated to respond to the exception ("The action describes the updates and procedures that must be invoked to respond to the exception occurrence." See Casati at p. 407, lines 25-26).

Nowhere does Casati teach predicting exceptions before they occur or performing actions to avoid predicted exceptions before they occur. In fact, Casati <u>teaches away</u> from predicting exceptions. Specifically, Casati discusses a type of exception known as "expected exceptions" (i.e., anomalies that are known in advance to the workflow designer). Casati explains that expected exceptions cannot be predicted:

> Expected exceptions are unpredictable, and therefore cannot be
> conveniently represented in the process in the form of special tasks and
> connections among tasks. (See Casati at p. 406, third paragraph, lines 4-6).

Casati repeatedly states that exceptions cannot be predicted. For example, on page 411, Casati provides examples of typical exceptions that occur in the car rental process. Casati then explains:

> Such situations cannot be efficiently modeled and handled within the flow
> structure, since they are asynchronous and their occurrence is not related
> to the completion of other tasks in the case. (See Casati at p. 411).

Thus, a large difference exists between the claims and Casati. The claims are directed to "predicting" exceptions before they occur, whereas Casati is directed to "handling" exceptions after they have already occurred.

Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of a claimed invention united in the same way. <u>RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc.</u>, 730 F.2d 1440, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Casati does not teach or even suggest predicting exceptions.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 15 and 23 and their dependent claims are allowable over Casati.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529